

REMARKS

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the interview granted on June 29, 2005. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks and the foregoing amendments.

During the interview, claim 12 was generally discussed and claim 1 was discussed in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,027 (Wright). With respect to claim 12, the undersigned proposed deletion of the phrase "or a propagated carrier signal," and the Examiner agreed that such an amendment would overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §101. Additionally, with respect to claim 1, the undersigned proposed to replace "closely corresponds" with "is similar." The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would likely overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §102 and would not require further searching in view of the Examiner's familiarity with this application.

Claims 25-36 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and as being directed to non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections because claim 25 has been amended to delete the phrase "or a propagated carrier signal."

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended by replacing the term "closely corresponds" with the term "is similar." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 29, lines 14-27 and page 30, lines 11-24 of the original specification. No new matter has been added. Entry of this amendment is believed proper under 37 CFR §1.116 and MPEP §714.13 because the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and because the foregoing amendments would not present new issues requiring further consideration or search in view of the Examiner's familiarity with this application. The foregoing amendments were not earlier presented because it was earnestly believed that the claims on file were already in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 4, 9-13, 16, 21-25, 28, and 33-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wright. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Wright

fails to describe or suggest determining if a word in a speech recognition result is similar to a portion of a phrase in the speech recognition result, as recited in each of the independent claims as currently amended.

In Wright, the user selects a block of previously-recognized text using the voice command "Select <word1> through <word2>". See Wright at col. 2, line 26 to col. 3, line 26. Using the example set out in the reply of July 12, 2004, if the speech recognition system of Wright had previously-recognized the sentence "Today, I saw a giraffe at the zoo," and the user speaks the command "Select <saw> through <giraffe>" then Wright's system produces a recognition result that includes the command "select," the word <saw>, and the phrase "through <giraffe> ordered." See Wright at col. 21, line 59 to col. 22, line 15. However, Wright does not determine if the word <saw> in the recognition result is similar to a portion of the phrase "through <giraffe> ordered" in the recognition result. Instead, Wright merely determines that the word <giraffe> occurs in previously-recognized text after the word <saw> in the previously-recognized text according to the constraint grammar associated with the Select command. See Wright at col. 22, lines 24-37. For at least these reasons, Wright fails to describe or suggest determining if a word in a speech recognition result is similar to a portion of a phrase in the speech recognition result. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable.

Claims 4, 9-12, 16, 21-25, 28, and 33-36 depend from one of claims 1, 13, and 25, and are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable and for containing allowable subject matter in their own right. For example, claims 4, 16, and 28 recite extraction of the word and the phrase from the recognition result. In Wright, the <word1> and the <word2> of the "Select <word1> through <word2>" command are extracted from previously-recognized text and not from the recognition result "Select <word1> through <word2>". See Wright at col. 21, line 58 to col. 22, line 23. As another example, claims 10, 22, and 34 recite determining if previously-recognized text has been selected. In Wright, the "Select <word1> through <word2>" command does not include determining if previously-recognized text has been selected because the command itself actually considers and selects previously-recognized text. See Wright at col. 21, line 58 to col. 22, line 23.

Claims 2, 14, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Wright in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,934 (Tang). Claims 2, 14, and 26 depend, respectively, from claims 1, 13, and 25, which were rejected as being anticipated by Wright. Tang fails to cure the deficiencies of Wright to describe or suggest determining if a word in a speech recognition result is similar to a portion of a phrase in the speech recognition result, as recited in each of claims 1, 13, and 25. Tang relates to recognition of sequences of spoken characters of the English alphabet and Arabic numerals in a Chinese speech recognition system. See Tang at col. 1, lines 37-47. Each numeral, alphabet letter, or command is represented by an easily-remembered code word that is included in Tang's vocabulary. See Tang at col. 1, lines 53-64 and Fig. 1. Tang's Chinese speech recognition system recognizes code words and Chinese words based on an acoustic similarity between a pronunciation of a spoken word and a pronunciation of the word in Tang's vocabulary. See Tang at col. 3, lines 11-30. However, Tang's Chinese speech recognition system does not determine if a word in a recognition result is similar to a portion of a phrase in the recognition result.

For at least this reason, claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable over any possible combination of Wright and Tang. Claims 2, 14, and 26 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable.

Applicant : Stijn Van Even et al.
Serial No. : 09/696,685
Filed : October 26, 2000
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 13865-081001

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2005

Diana DiBerardino
Diana DiBerardino
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40277232.doc

Applicant : Stijn Van Even et al.
Serial No. : 09/696,685
Filed : October 26, 2000
Page : 8 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 13865-081001

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 12 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 12.

In Figure 12, the line connecting box 1280 to the arrow between box 1205 and 1210 has been changed to an arrow.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)